

*Time Allocation*

situation in which the emergency itself is a matter of dispute, it seems that the word "genuine" implies that the rule should be used where at least the emergency itself is not a matter of argument.

The question of a genuine crisis, an emergency in the country, is not one which generally in and of itself is not subject to argument. Again I say I could never rule out forever because there could always be a situation which I cannot anticipate. Basically I am inclined to rule against the application of this rule where the very emergency itself is a matter of interpretation or a matter of argument.

Therefore in this situation where the government maintains it is appropriate to take a step, the opposition, and the hon. member for Oshawa in particular, maintain that it is not only not appropriate but that it precipitates an emergency or crisis. That seems to become a matter of argument. Therefore, the question whether the word "genuine" would be applicable seems to come into doubt.

The second paragraph to which I would refer is subparagraph (5) of the rule:

In determining whether a matter should have urgent consideration, Mr. Speaker shall have regard . . . to the probability of the matter being brought before the House within reasonable time by other means.

I cannot, of course, ignore the fact that tomorrow evening the House is scheduled to receive a budget. Even though the budget debate may be deferred a day or two until Friday, there is, I believe, an impending vote of confidence in our normal practices on the entire economic policy of the government in the most direct and forthright way. I do not know how the House could improve on that practice. Therefore, under that paragraph I would be disinclined to allow a debate of this sort.

For those two reasons I am not prepared to accept the hon. member's application at this time.

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

#### ALLOCATION OF TIME TO CONSIDER COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE STAGE OF BILL C-20

The House resumed, from Friday, December 7, consideration of the motion of Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton):

That in relation to Bill C-20, an act to amend the Income Tax Act to provide tax credit in respect of mortgage interest and home owner property tax, one sitting day shall be allotted to the further consideration in Committee of the Whole stage of the bill; and

That, at fifteen minutes before the expiry of the time provided for government business on that day, any proceeding before the committee shall be interrupted, if required, for the purpose of this order and, in turn, every question then necessary in order to dispose of the Committee of the Whole stage of the bill shall be put forthwith and successively, without further debate or amendment.

[Mr. Speaker.]

**Mr. David Kilgour (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, I believe that I spoke for approximately three minutes on Friday. Therefore I have another six or seven minutes. I will operate on that premise, if it pleases you, Mr. Speaker.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that members were listening carefully to the point that Bill C-20 appears to have broad support across Canada, particularly in western Canada. I suggested that the measure appears to be popular everywhere in this country. Do the 17 Liberal members who opted to miss the vote on second reading disagree with this? Do the three Liberals who voted for the measure disagree with this statement? What about the five NDP members who missed the vote? Is it a coincidence—

[Translation]

**Mr. Corbin:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member who has the floor is commenting on the vote we had the other day in the House. I suggest that this is quite contrary to our practices and our Standing Orders, Mr. Speaker, and that pursuant to our Standing Orders, the hon. member should stop forthwith making these remarks on the vote, its quality, as well as on those who were present and those who were not.

[English]

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member is perhaps getting into a hazardous area in casting reflections on the reasons or motives for members voting in the House. I do not think he did that in his remark, but it is a dangerous area. Incidentally, it is convenient now to formally advise the hon. member that his time expires at 4.22 p.m.

**Mr. Kilgour:** I was going to point out that my information is that about 69.8 per cent of the constituents of the hon. member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin) live in houses; in the riding of the hon. member for Saskatoon East (Mr. Ogle), 65 per cent; in the riding of the hon. member for Mission-Port Moody (Mr. Rose), 77 per cent; in that of the hon. member for Comox-Powell River (Mr. Skelly), 71 per cent; and in the riding of the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters), 69 per cent. I will not pursue that line of unfair accusations against members opposite.

The hon. member for Gander-Twillingate (Mr. Baker) was quoted as saying that "the party is wrong", referring to the party opposite, "and I am right; I listened to all the arguments against the bill and they do not hold any water".

[Translation]

The hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier) made the following statement on December 4, as reported on page 2010 of the official report of our Debates for that day, and I quote:

We have been asking this for years from various governments and especially from the Liberals in the 17 years they have been in power. We have asked for the measure that was partially introduced today, that is, to give the same benefits to single family home owners as to owners of multiple rental units. The Liberals have always benefited big housebuilders by giving them every possible exemption, but never did they do anything for the small home owner.